



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We have here a Callinus at the time of Lucian and Pausanias, for they were contemporaries, who was so widely known that he needed no introductory phrases, and this Callinus was no ancient poet of Ephesus, but a living bookmaker, just the man to palm off a poem by Antimachus as if it were worthy of Homer.

It seems incredible that when Lucian wrote the name Callinus his readers should have immediately understood that a bookmaker of their own day was intended, but when Pausanias used that same name these same readers should have understood thereby the elegiac poet of Ephesus.

If we follow the manuscripts and prefer the form Caeleus or if we accept the conjectural Callinus we are in either case forced to the conclusion that Pausanias has not furnished the slightest evidence with which to support the theory that Homer was known as the author of the *Thebais* in the seventh century B.C.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NOTE ON LUCRETIUS 1. 80

In turning over the pages of that not entirely critical best seller, Professor James Harvey Robinson's *Mind in the Making*, I came upon Lucretius 1. 80 ff.

ne forte rearis
impia te rationis inire elementa viamque
indugredi sceleris

quoted to support the idea of an opposition between reason and religion in the translation "the fear of treading on the 'unholy grounds of reason and in the path of sin.'" The idea of the impiety of reason and its inferiority to sentiment is, as I believe Mill somewhere says, foreign to, or at least rare in, the philosophical ancients. I have always taken it for granted that *ratio* here means specifically the Epicurean or atomic philosophy and that *impia* is felt as a transferred epithet qualifying it. So I at first assumed that Professor Robinson's translation was merely another example of the well-known indifference of advanced thinkers to the facts of history and criticism which, as even the New Republic was constrained to point out, is exemplified elsewhere in his book. But on turning to Munro I find that Professor Robinson was quoting the Authorized Version so to speak. As it is plainly wrong in the impression it conveys if not in intent and as Munro does not comment on the point a correction seems worth while. I do not think that authority will be needed by anyone who re-reads the passage in the light of the context and of Lucretian and Latin usage. But instead of a laborious collection of parallel passages I will quote two or three of the

latest and best authorities. Giussani renders: "Ma forse temi ch'io t'insegni una dottrina sacrilega?" and comments "Impia, anche questo è pel senso, piuttosto aggett. di rationis che di elementa." Alfred Ernout in the edition of the Association Budé translates "Peut-être vas-tu croire que tu t'inities aux éléments d'une science impie." Merrill's interpretation (1906) is virtually the same. For the rest the old Delphini edition in its *variorum* notes already has *impia rationis elementa* [*pro elementa impiae rationis. Figura huic nostro et Virgilio familiaris. Ratio autem θεωρία est, philosophandi studium, etc. Posset et pro secta sumi uti a Lucretio alibi ea vox usurpata est. Fab.* Munro must have been aware of this but apparently thought comment unnecessary. The moral is the old one that it is never safe to quote the classics in translation for scientific or argumentative purposes.

PAUL SHOREY